

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

BRYAN POOLE	:	
3826 Albemarle Ave	:	
Drexel Hill, PA 19026	:	CIVIL ACTION
:		
Plaintiff,	:	No.: _____
:		
v.	:	
:		
TRIPLE CANOPY, INC.	:	<b>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</b>
13530 Dulles Tech Drive #500	:	
Herndon, VA 20171	:	
and	:	
CONSTELLIS HOLDINGS, INC.	:	
d/b/a CONSTELLIS	:	
13530 Dulles Tech Drive #500	:	
Herndon, VA 20171	:	
:		
Defendants.	:	
:		

**CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT**

Bryan Poole (*hereinafter* referred to as “Plaintiff,” unless indicated otherwise) by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiff has initiated this action to redress violations by Triple Canopy, Inc. and Constellis Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Constellis (*hereinafter* referred to as “Defendants”) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII” – 42 U.S.C. §§ 200d *et seq.*), Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (“Section 1981” – 42 U.S.C. § 1981), and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act (“PHRA”).<sup>1</sup> As a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s claims under the PHRA are referenced herein for notice purposes. He is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file his lawsuit in advance of same

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1333(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws.

3. This Court may properly assert personal jurisdiction over Defendants because its contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendants to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945), and its progeny.

4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1333(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because Defendants are deemed to reside where it is subjected to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendants residents of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

5. Plaintiff is proceeding herein after properly exhausting all administrative remedies with respect to such claims by timely filing a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) and by filing the instant lawsuit within ninety (90) days of receiving a notice of dismissal and/or right to sue letter from the EEOC.

**PARTIES**

6. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

7. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.

---

because of the date of issuance of his federal right-to-sue-letter under Title VII. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will mirror identically his federal claims under Title VII and 1981.

8. Defendant Triple Canopy, Inc is a private security company that provides security and other services to corporate, government and nonprofit clients, including at the William Green, Jr. Federal Building, located at 600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19106 where Plaintiff primarily worked.

9. Defendant Constellis Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Constellis is a privately-held defense and security company, which previously merged with Defendant Triple Canopy, Inc. and provides similar security related services, including at the William Green, Jr. Federal Building, located at 600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19106 where Plaintiff primarily worked.

10. Defendant Triple Canopy, Inc and Defendant Constellis Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Constellis share a common business/principal office address at the above captioned address, a common mailing address at the above captioned address, and share and have interrelation of operations, management, and employees.

11. Because of their interrelation of operations or management, centralized control and sharing of labor, commingling of funds, common ownership or management, common financial controls, and other factors, Defendants are sufficiently interrelated and integrated that they may be treated as a single and/or joint employer for purposes of the instant action.

12. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

13. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

14. Plaintiff is a black (African-American) male.

15. Plaintiff was hired in or about 2017 as a Security Officer working for Defendants.

16. As noted *supra*, Plaintiff was considered based out of and/or working primarily from the William Green, Jr. Federal Building, located at 600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19106.

17. During his employment, Plaintiff was primarily supervised by Lieutenant Carl Metroka (Caucasian - *hereinafter* “Metroka”).

18. The large majority of Defendants’ upper management, particularly at the William Green, Jr. Federal Building, are almost entirely Caucasian and/or non-black.

19. Based on Plaintiff’s observations and belief, African-American employees were often treated differently and less favorably than Caucasian employees by Caucasian upper management.

20. Indeed, Plaintiff and other African-American employees were also subjected to hostility and animosity through racially-discriminatory and disparate treatment.

21. By way of example, but not intended to be an exhaustive list: (1) policies were selectively enforced against African-American employees; (2) Plaintiff and other African-American employees were treated in a derogatory and demeaning way and regularly talked down to, particularly by Lieutenant Metroka; (3) African-American employees were treated less favorably with regards to building assignments and treatment by management; (4) African-American employees were subjected to unfair discipline and termination, unlike their Caucasian and/or non-black co-workers for the same or similar infractions; and (5) unlike the Caucasian and/or non-black co-workers, Plaintiff and other African-American employees were not given progressive discipline, but instead, were regularly terminated for first offenses.

22. During his employment, Plaintiff complained to upper management that he was being treated unfairly and hostilely and singled out by Metroka, but instead of investigating Plaintiff's concerns, they were ignored.

23. As a result, Metroka subjected Plaintiff to even greater hostility and animosity, including berating Plaintiff, telling Plaintiff he "did not like" him, and that he would "get to the bottom of this" (without advising Plaintiff what he was referring to).

24. Further, upon information and belief, on several occasions Metroka would pull only Plaintiff's logbooks in an attempt to find some reason to discipline and/or terminate Plaintiff.

25. Plaintiff was then terminated on or about July 13, 2021, for alleged "post abandonment" and "falsifying government documents" for taking a brief break to refrain from falling asleep during an 8-hour shift without a single break, and without noting the break in Plaintiff's logbook, despite the fact that Plaintiff had followed the proper sign out procedures and had noted the break in his logbook.

26. Defendants' reason for Plaintiff's termination is completely pretextual because (1) Plaintiff had worked hard for Defendants and performed his job well; (2) Plaintiff's termination went against Defendants' documented policies, which call for progressive discipline steps, including but not limited to a 5-day suspension for first offenses and prior to termination; (3) Caucasian and/or non-black security guards were regularly given multiple chances and afforded progressive discipline for taking unauthorized breaks and were rarely (if ever) disciplined or terminated for not documenting same in their log books (i.e., upon information and belief, at least one Caucasian employee left his post and the site entirely to visit a drugstore, but was only given a write-up and retained his job; another Caucasian employee admitted to leaving his post and doing homework in his car but was not terminated for same; and a Caucasian Lieutenant falsified

documents (which was investigated by the federal police) in order to avoid a fine, but has not been terminated for same); and (4) Plaintiff followed the proper sign out procedures before taking his break to refrain from falling asleep at Plaintiff's post (a two-person post) – which is an immediately terminable offense.

27. Furthermore, upon information and belief, unlike Caucasian and/or non-black employees, Defendants had a pattern and practice of unfairly terminating black employees for petty and/or minor infractions under the guise of "post abandonment" and "falsifying government documents."

28. For example, around the time of Plaintiff's termination (July of 2021), Defendants unfairly terminated at least one other black employee Tyshon Hasty against Defendants' documented policies, for a first offense for the same or similar reasons as Plaintiff.

29. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that Plaintiff was subjected to a hostile work environment and terminated because of his race and Plaintiff's objections to and/or complaints of race discrimination.

**COUNT I**  
**Violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII")**  
**([1] Race Discrimination; [2] Retaliation; and [3] Hostile Work Environment)**

30. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

31. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, he was subjected to discrimination, retaliation, and a hostile work environment through disparate treatment as outlined *supra* because of his race.

32. Plaintiff was terminated for completely pretextual reasons.

33. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that Plaintiff was subjected to a hostile work environment and terminated because of his race and Plaintiff's objections to/complaints of race discrimination.

34. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of Title VII.

**COUNT II**

**Violations of 42 U.S.C. Section 1981**

**([1] Race Discrimination; [2] Retaliation; and [3] Hostile Work Environment)**

35. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

36. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, he was subjected to discrimination, retaliation, and a hostile work environment through disparate treatment as outlined *supra* because of his race.

37. Plaintiff was terminated for completely pretextual reasons.

38. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that Plaintiff was subjected to a hostile work environment and terminated because of his race and Plaintiff's objections to/complaints of race discrimination.

39. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of Section 1981.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

A. Defendants are to promulgate and adhere to a policy prohibiting discrimination in the future against any employee(s);

B. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary pay increases, bonuses, insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement and seniority;

C. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive damages as permitted by applicable law, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for their willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendants or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;

D. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress, pain, suffering and humiliation); and

E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law.

F. Plaintiff is to be given a jury trial as demanded in the caption of this Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

**KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.**



By:

---

Ari R. Karpf, Esq.  
3331 Street Road  
Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128  
Bensalem, PA 19020  
(215) 639-0801

Dated: January 26, 2022

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIACASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

Bryan Poole

v.

Triple Canopy, Inc., et al.

NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

## SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ( )

(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )

(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ( )

(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ( )

(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ( )

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (X)

1/26/2022

Date


Attorney-at-law

Plaintiff

Attorney for

(215) 639-0801(215) 639-4970akarpf@karpf-law.comTelephoneFAX NumberE-Mail Address

**DESIGNATION FORM**

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 3826 Albemarle Avenue, Drexel Hill, PA 19026

Address of Defendant: 13530 Dulles Tech Drive, #500, Herndon, VA 20171

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business

**RELATED CASE, IF ANY:**

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Terminated: \_\_\_\_\_

Civil cases are deemed related when **Yes** is answered to any of the following questions:

1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case  is /  is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 1/26/2022

ARK2484 / 91538

*Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff*

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

**CIVIL: (Place a ✓ in one category only)**

**A. Federal Question Cases:**

- 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
- 2. FELA
- 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- 4. Antitrust
- 5. Patent
- 6. Labor-Management Relations
- 7. Civil Rights
- 8. Habeas Corpus
- 9. Securities Act(s) Cases
- 10. Social Security Review Cases
- 11. All other Federal Question Cases  
(Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:**

- 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- 3. Assault, Defamation
- 4. Marine Personal Injury
- 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Products Liability
- 8. Products Liability – Asbestos
- 9. All other Diversity Cases  
(Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

I, Ari R. Karpf, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:

Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 1/26/2022

ARK2484 / 91538

*Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff*

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

**I. (a) PLAINTIFFS**

POOLE, BRYAN

**(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff** Delaware  
*(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)*

**(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)**

Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, P.C.; 3331 Street Road, Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128, Bensalem, PA 19020; (215) 639-0801; akarpf@karpf-law.com

**DEFENDANTS**

TRIPLE CANOPY, INC., ET AL.

**County of Residence of First Listed Defendant** Fairfax  
*(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)*

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys *(If Known)*

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question <i>(U.S. Government Not a Party)</i>
2 U.S. Government Defendant	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity <i>(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)</i>

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES** *(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)*

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	1	1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	4	4
Citizen of Another State	2	2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	5	5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	3	Foreign Nation	6	6

**IV. NATURE OF SUIT** *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b>	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine	310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
<input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product Liability	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury	<b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment
<input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	330 Federal Employers' Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights	<input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust
<input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	330 Federal Employers' Liability	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent	<input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking
<input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act	340 Marine	380 Other Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	<input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce
<input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product Liability	<b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark	<input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation
<input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud	<b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
<input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	371 Truth in Lending	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff)	<input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit
<input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract	360 Other Personal Injury	380 Other Personal Property Damage	<input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923)	<input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV
<input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability	362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
<input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise			<input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI	<input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b>	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b>	<b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts
<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation	<input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	<b>Habeas Corpus:</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters
<input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting	463 Alien Detainee	<b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	<b>442 Employment</b>	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	<input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	<input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration
<input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/ Accommodations	530 General	<input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
<input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	535 Death Penalty		<input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
<input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	<b>Other:</b>		
	448 Education	540 Mandamus & Other		
		550 Civil Rights		
		555 Prison Condition		
		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		

**V. ORIGIN** *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Original Proceeding	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Removed from State Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Reinstated or Reopened	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File
--	---	--	---	--	--	---

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (*Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity*):  
 Title VII (42 USC 2000); Section 1981 (42 USC 1981)

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION**

Brief description of cause:  
 Violations of Title VII, Section 1981 and the PHRA.

**VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION  
 UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  
**JURY DEMAND:**  Yes  No

**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY**

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 1/26/2022

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY-OF-RECORD

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

**Print****Save As...****Reset**